



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/408,634	09/30/1999	MARK WISNIEWSKI	AVERP2514USA	4276
7590	10/21/2003		EXAMINER	
WILLIAM C TRITT			HYLTON, ROBIN ANNETTE	
RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR PLL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1621 EUCLID AVENUE				
19TH FLOOR			3727	
CLEVELAND, OH 44115			DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003	

23

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/408,634

Applicant(s)

WISNIEWSKI ET AL. M

Examiner

Robin A. Hylton

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-17,20-24,26-33 and 35-39 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-17,20-24,26-29,31-33 and 35-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \*    c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.</li> <li>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</li> <li>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</li> </ol> |
|--|--|

Art Unit: 3727

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. Claims 1,3-17,20-24,26-29,31-33,35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the claims are rejected for the following reasons:

It is unclear if the second occurrence of "at least one on-bondable are" in each of the independent claims is the same as the first occurrence. If so, "said at least one non-bondable are" should be used instead.

Dependent claims not specifically mentioned are rejected as depending from rejected base claims since they inherently contain the same deficiencies therein.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. Claims 1,3-14,23,29,31,32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freedman in view of Hatano et al. (US 4,915,289) and Davis (US 5,637,366).

Freedman as modified teaches the claimed closure except for bondable and non-bondable areas on the first and second layers of the closure. the films being uniaxially oriented.

Hatano teaches a closure having bondable and non-bondable areas on the upper and/or lower surface of the closure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of bondable and non-bondable areas on the layers of the closure of Freedman. Doing so saves material and provides a more easily openable closure.

Davis teaches it is known to uniaxially or biaxially orient films of laminate structure (column 1, line 42).

Art Unit: 3727

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further apply the teaching of a uniaxially orientation to the modified closure of Freedman. Doing so is an obvious matter of design choice known in the art.

Regarding claims 9,14, and 32, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a heat seal bonding material since the examiner takes Official Notice of the equivalence of pressure sensitive adhesive material and heat seal material for their use in the closure art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to secure a closure to a container would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Freedman discloses a range for the peel strength at the separation interface of less than 50 Newtons/meter. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the peel strength in the range of 30 to 40 grams per 1-inch or 2-inch width at 90° peel, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

Freedman is silent regarding specific polymeric film material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any of the known polymeric materials for the film layers, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

3. Claims 15-17,20-22,33,35-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer et al. (US 6,032,8540 in view of Freedman, Hatano, and Davis.

Greer teaches a container (i.e., an envelope) having a flap and a closure. Greer is silent regarding a directionally peelable closure as set forth in the claims.

Art Unit: 3727

Freedman teaches it is known to provide a directionally peelable closure of laminate layers.

Hatano teaches it is known to provide a closure having bondable and non-bondable areas on the upper and/or lower surface of the closure.

Davis teaches it is known to uniaxially or biaxially orient films of laminate structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of a directionally peelable closure of laminate layers, to apply bondable and non-bondable areas to upper and lower surfaces of the closure, and to apply the teaching of a uniaxial orientation. Doing so provides a more easily removable closure.

Regarding claims 36 and 39, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a heat seal bonding material since the examiner takes Official Notice of the equivalence of pressure sensitive adhesive material and heat seal material for their use in the closure art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to secure a closure to a container would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

4. Claims 24 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freedman in view of Davis et al. (US 5,637,366).

Freedman teaches the claimed closure except for the films being uniaxially oriented and the bondable material being at least one heat seal material.

Davis teaches it is known to uniaxially or biaxially orient films of laminate structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of a uniaxial orientation to the closure of Freedman. Doing so is an obvious matter of design choice known in the art.

Regarding claim 27, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a heat seal bonding material since the examiner takes Official Notice of the equivalence of pressure sensitive adhesive material and heat seal material for their use in the closure art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to secure a closure to a container would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17,20-224,26-29,31-33, and 35-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
6. Applicant's arguments filed July 28, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's attention is directed to column 1, line 42 of Davis which states "orienting it uniaxially or biaxially" as it describes a **known** method of preparing multilayer laminate film. To uniaxially or biaxially orient film would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the intended use of the film.

In response to applicant's argument that freeman does not teach a cover, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3727

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703) 872-9302 or (703) 872-9303 for after final amendments. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3720 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

9. It is called to applicant's attention that if a communication is faxed before the reply time has expired, applicant may submit the reply with a "Certificate of Facsimile" which merely asserts that the reply is being faxed on a given date. So faxed, before the period for reply has expired, the reply may be considered timely. A suggested format for a certificate follows:

I hereby certify that this correspondence for Application Serial No. \_\_\_\_\_ is being facsimiled to The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via fax number (703) 872-\_\_\_\_ on the date shown below:

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3727

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robin Hylton whose telephone number is (703) 308-1208. The examiner works a flexible schedule, but can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee Young, can be reached on (703) 308-2572.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g., copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, form PTO-892, etc., requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Errica Bembry at (703) 306-4005.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

RAH  
October 20, 2003

  
Robin A. Hylton  
Primary Examiner  
GAU 3727